

**1961 (Sept): Journal of the National Chiropractic Association [31(9)]** includes:

-**John F. Thie**, D.C. authors "News flashes: CALIFORNIA" (p. 46):

LACC Golden Anniversary Homecoming

Plans for the LACC Golden Anniversary Homecoming are progressing rapidly. The program will have outstanding speakers on all chiropractic subjects. President of the Alumni Association, Dr. Smilax Sandau, states that Dr. **John Thie** will be program coordinator.

The Los Angeles County Chiropractic Society Auxiliary will assist by arranging a ladies educational program during the homecoming.

Dr. George Haynes, dean of the college, invites all of LACC undergraduate and graduate school alumni to participate in the Golden Anniversary. Two action son the part of all alumni will make this homecoming the memorable one it should be: attending the homecoming, and pledge a regular monthly donation to the college's building fund.

On Tuesday, July 25, 1961, the "**CREES**" case went to trial. This case has been in the courts for the past two years. In the original form, the case sought an injunction for five doctors of chiropractic against the State Medical Board prohibiting the Medical Board's coming into their offices and arresting them under section 2141/2142 of the Business and Professions Code (practicing medicine without a license). In addition, the suit sought declaratory relief (asked the court to define chiropractic and its scope of practice).

Through legal maneuvers, the case now is "**CREES**" (a group of D.C.'s generally favoring a very broad interpretation of the scope of chiropractic practice) versus the State of California's Medical Board, Osteopathic Board, and Chiropractic Board.

Since this suit could and probably will affect not only the practice of chiropractic in California, but also all over the nation, the NCA petitioned the court to allow the NCA-NCIC attorney in California, C.P. VonHerzen, to represent the NCA members in California as an amicus curiae (friend of the court). The California Chiropractic Association has employed Attorney Jerome Schnimmer, Los Angeles, in the same capacity. The judge would not allow either attorney to appear as amicus curiae, but allowed the NCA and CCA attorneys to speak only on issues which Mr. Newby, attorney for **CREES**, wished to have them support.

Any remarks made by the NCA and CCA attorneys did not affect the outcome of the trial due to the stipulation by the attorneys of record that the case would be decided on the pretrial order and briefs.

No witnesses were to be called, and only offers of proof were to be submitted. It seems that the results of the trial will be adverse to the plaintiffs (**CREES**). The judge has not, at this writing, given his written opinion, but in his oral statement to the attorneys, he is alleged t have stated that a doctor of chiropractic can be prosecuted under 2141 and 2142 by the Medical Board, that a chiropractor cannot practice obstetrics, that a chiropractor can adjust the articulations of the body and use the necessary mechanical, hygienic, and sanitary measures incident to the case of the body.

At this time these findings apply only to **CREES** and the plaintiff doctors. If this case is appealed and lost, it will become law and affect all doctors of chiropractic in California. – **John F. Thie**, D.C., NCA state delegate.